

**REMARKS**

Claims 14, 15 and 17-26 are pending. Claims 1-13 and 16 are currently canceled. Claim 14 is currently amended. Claim 14 has been amended to incorporate all of the limitations of claim 17. Claim 14 has also been amended to overcome the § 112 rejections. Please cancel claim 17 without prejudice. Based upon the Office Action dated December 1, 2009, the Examiner has indicated that with this amendment, the claim set is in condition for allowance. For this reason, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter the amendment since it puts the case in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

**§ 112 Rejections**

Claims 14-15 and 17-26 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as purportedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. It is the Examiner's position that claim 14 has the phrases "A crosslinked heat-activatable adhesive" and "one or more crosslinking agents, in amounts of less than about 0.25 wt%, capable of effecting crosslinking of the one or more novolac phenolic resins" is indefinite since it is unclear if Applicant is claiming a crosslinked adhesive or an adhesive that is capable of being crosslinked.

The Applicants have amended claim 14 to eliminate the term "crosslinked" to obviate this rejection.

Claim 17 has been canceled obviating the dependency error that existed previous to the claim cancellation.

Claims 15 and 18-26 depend upon amended claim 14 and add further limitations thereto. Since amended claim 14 is patentable, likewise so are claims 15 and 18-26.

In summary, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 14-15 and 17-26 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome, and that the rejection should be withdrawn.

**§ 103 Rejections**

Claims 14-15 and 18-25 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa et al. (US 5,385,979). It is the Examiner's position that Ozawa teaches an adhesive composition comprising a heat-reactive phenolic resin, prepared as a novolac phenolic resin and an elastomer, such as chlorinated natural rubber.

The Applicants have amended claim 14 to incorporate all of the limitations of claim 17 which has been canceled. These limitations, simply stated, are that of a heat-activatable adhesive comprising from about 30 to about 70 wt.% nitrile butadiene rubber. Ozawa does not teach or suggest the recited adhesive further including wherein the elastomer comprises nitrile butadiene rubber, as stated by the Examiner on page 6 of the Office Action of December 1, 2009. Furthermore, the Examiner has stated that “[T]he prior art does not teach motivation or suggestion for modification to make the invention as claimed instantly. Thus amended claim 14 is allowable.

Claims 15 and 18-25 depend upon amended claim 14 and add further limitations thereto. Since claim 14 is allowable, likewise so are claims 15 and 18-25.

The rejection of claim 14-15 and 18-25 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa et al. (US 5,385,979) has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Ozawa et al. (U.S. 5,385,979) in view of Kropf et al. (U.S. 6,500,891). It is the Examiner's position that Kropf teaches an adhesive comprising novolac phenolic resin which is used to bond an electronic part of a circuit board to a chip and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have substituted the adhesive composition of Ozawa for the adhesive composition of Kropf in order to bond electronic parts.

Claim 26 depends upon amended claim 14 and adds further limitations thereto. The Applicants have already shown how amended claim 14 overcomes Ozawa by defining the elastomer as a nitrile butadiene resin. Kropf does not teach a nitrile butadiene rubber elastomer as required by Applicant's amended claim 14. Since neither Ozawa nor Kropf teach a nitrile butadiene rubber elastomer as required by amended claim 14, the amendment of claim 14 has obviated the Examiner's rejection of claim 26. Thus, claim 26 is also allowable.

If the Examiner has any further questions or suggestions it is requested that he contact the Applicant.

Examination and reconsideration of the application as amended is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

---

8-December-2009  
Date

By: \_\_\_\_\_/Stephen F. Wolf/

Stephen F. Wolf, Reg. No.: 45,502  
Telephone No.: 651-736-9485

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833